

**PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES
COMMISSIONER'S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA
MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2015**

	<i>Members Present</i>	<i>Members Absent</i>
<i>District 1</i>		<i>Val Hillers</i>
	<i>Dean Enell – Vice Chair</i>	
	<i>Karen Krug</i>	
<i>District 2</i>		<i>Jeffery Wallin– Chair</i>
	<i>George Saul</i>	
		<i>Darin Hand</i>
<i>District 3</i>		<i>Wayne Havens</i>
	<i>Beth Munson</i>	
	<i>Scott Yonkman</i>	

Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Vice Chair Enell.

ROLL CALL

Beth Munson, Karen Krug, Dean Enell, Scott Yonkman, George Saul

MINUTES

None

Planning staff present: Dave Wechner – Director, Planning and Community Development, Amanda Almgren – Long Range Planner, Meredith Penny – Long Range Planner, Greg Goforth – Critical Areas Planner, Nathan Howard – Long Range Planner

Health staff present: Keith Higman – Director, Public Health and Department of Natural Resources, Doug Kelly – Environmental Health Hydrogeologist

Public Works staff present: Bill Oakes – Public Works Director

Vice Chair Enell read the Planning Commission agenda to the public.

Dave Wechner explained the purpose of Planning Commission Workshops and the difference between public comment and public testimony.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mary Walsh, Neighbors Interested in Commonsense Economics, Langley

Ms. Walsh had two points to discuss. She prefaced her comments stating that Neighbors enthusiastically supports the wineries, farms and all of the Island's many festivals and events. Scale and location are important.

- She is concerned about the survey that will be sent to the random residents in the three planning areas. She questioned how many surveys will be returned and how valuable it will be if random people have never thought about the issues and consequences. She used her experience with the Comfort Winery as an example.
- She read the three transcripts from the focus group meetings in March. She said it is necessary to understand the difference between the focus groups.
 - She stated the South Whidbey's Commissioner chose four articulate event center owners in addition to two people who wrote letters to the Planning Department

and testified in favor of the Comforts in the 2014 appeal hearing. In the Focus Group there were numerous business owners, missing from the table were neighbors of any event centers. She read more excerpts from the focus group transcripts.

- She also discussed the recent noise violation by Mo's Pub in Langley.

Al Peyser, Langley

Mr. Peyser said there is anticipation there will be a new zoning ordinance in Freeland. He has not received any commitment from the Planning Department that businesses and residents will be involved in the writing of the code. He is asking for their involvement in the formulation of the code.

Tim Kangas, Freeland

Mr. Kangas wanted to discuss the rural land use issues. He referred to the package he submitted analyzing the March Focus Groups and a number of issues he has previously addressed. He said it boils down to commercial business activities conducted in the rural environment where they are not expected or seen. He was stunned that 75% of respondents in the community surveys indicated that the existing character of rural areas should be protected even if it requires additional restrictions on new development and land use. He thinks it is important to make a very clear distinction that the current Code does allow events to occur but it does restrict other activities where they are not in the community's best interest. He said part of the reason there is such a great quality of life is due to the existing land use code restrictions and permit processes. They are not necessarily followed or enforced however. He discussed the issues Woodinville is having with wineries. There are a lot of establishments that are stretching the rules and again getting into the same kind of conflict seen occurring in Island County. He stated it is not winery and wine tasting issues that generally cause complaints in this County; it is commercial events held at any location in the rural areas. He recommended that the three parts of the conundrum be considered simultaneously.

- Quality of life trying to be protected with the Code.
- The existing Code.
- The currently allowed land use activities in the rural space and additional ancillary value activities being permitted.

He said it is not about the people who enjoy the peaceful and ideal quality of life here that are asking for changes in the code and process, it is those who currently can't do things that are causing the complaints and want changes made to the land use process.

Marianne Edain, WEAN, Langley

Ms. Edain stated she has been dealing with a graft of permits, variances and all sorts of interesting things that seem to be allowed under the present Code. She discussed one builder/developer/logger who buys a piece of property, logs it under a non-conversion permit from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), then asks Island County to lift the development moratorium to allow development instead of asking Island County for a conversion permit to a use other than forestry. What is being seen is a conversion of the forested lands to uses other than forestry by wiggling and squiggling through loopholes in the Code. She met with Dave Wechner when he first started with a list of 52 such items. A few items have been dealt with, but more of them have come up. She discussed the Conversion Option Harvest Plan (COHP) through DNR. Someone can log under DNR's regulations which are much more lax

concerning wetlands and steep slopes. It appears that COHPs are not to be used outside of Urban Growth Boundaries; it is another item that the Planning Commission and Board need to be looking at. There are loopholes that allow for conversions and abuse of land. WEAN will be submitting a list of items as they find them and asking for corrections to close those loopholes.

Vice Chair Enell commented that he would like the opportunity to have a workshop on the conversion options that are available and how they are being used.

Ray Gabelein, Langley

Mr. Gabelein wanted to discuss the Existing Conditions Report.

- He referred to Table 5-2 Base Line Monitoring and Water Quality Reports. He discussed the fecal matter and water quality standards.
- He suggested not to take the approach that Ag is a problem and put more regulations on the Ag community. He believes this will lead to more Ag operators leaving the land. If farms and operators are to be maintained, do not increase regulations and larger buffers.
- He encourages a similar approach to be used on this topic as the BMPs. One of the worst water quality problems is the outfall in the Freeland Park. It had nothing to do with agriculture; it had to deal with commercial and residential waste water.
- Agricultural operations attract waterfowl. Migratory geese no longer migrate. The waterfowl are causing the poor water quality on the properties not cattle.
- The Ag operators in the spring, summer, fall, are very busy people. It is hard to find help to get things done. He asked that the Comp Plan meetings be held in the evening and more people may attend the meetings.

Vice Chair Enell asked Dave Wechner to address what kind of public outreach will proceed formulating the rural event center regulations that are being contemplated this year and next year.

Dave Wechner answered Vice Chair Enell's question that when the Planning Commission made recommendations on the Scope of the Comp Plan to discuss the possibility of a Planning Commission Subcommittee; staff went to the Board with that idea. They did not get all the support to staff that effort. The Board in response to the Rural Land Surveys that will be going out and some of the other feedback they are receiving from the community, he thinks there is a ground for support of those topics. Staff is looking at increasing the survey sample size to get a better response.

Vice Chair Enell recommended the survey be targeted to the neighbors surrounding those operations and the applicants who have those operations.

Dave Wechner responded to Vice Chair Enell's question that it is hard to target people in a particular area at the same time when trying to get a random sample throughout the County about how people feel about the issues since they are two different focus areas.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dave Wechner discussed the Director's Report. He reminded the Planning Commission and the public there will be two community meetings hosted by the County and being conducted by the

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). They will be focused on the flood maps that are proposed for Island County. The first meeting will be held on August 26 at 6:00 p.m. at the Coupeville Recreation Hall and on August 27 at 6:00 p.m. at the Camano Center. There is information available on the County's Planning Department website; there is a link to a map viewer which allows the public to see how the new floodplain map might affect their particular property. There is another link that leads the user to a legend for the map and an e-mail address to request to have a particular property's flood map printed for a particular meeting. For those who are unable to attend a meeting, staff will find a way to connect them with their individualized map.

Commissioner Yonkman thanked Dave Wechner for his effort in putting the Director's Report together. A report like this has not been available in past years and it gives a monthly state of the department which is helpful and appreciated.

Dave Wechner said there are other performance matrices that are being worked on and are not fully developed yet in software, which will provide information to track items like permit review times, etc.

Vice Chair Enell asked if the new housing starts will be higher this year than last year's 13% increase.

Dave Wechner responded that the total yearly starts for this year were 122 compared to 114 last year. An increase of 8 starts is not very large from one year to the next but the number of actual permits that have come into the Building Department is greater than last year.

Commissioner Yonkman stated in the past, home improvement permits were not included in the count. Some of the home improvements are major and would have some significant impact in the permit process and staff time.

NEW BUSINESS

Public Works – Hearing and deliberation: Adoption of the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2021 and the Capital Improvement Program 2016-2021.

Bill Oakes presented the Island County's Six Year Plan for Capital Facilities. He highlighted the larger projects from north to south on Whidbey Island and then Camano Island.

Whidbey Island

- Monkey Hill/Henney –standardize the intersection to make it safer.
- Crescent Harbor/Regatta-intersection project being worked on in conjunction with the City of Oak Harbor and the Navy to improve safety.
- Reservation and Crescent – realignment to make it safer and more standard.
- Clover Valley/Ault Field/Heller – Feasibility study for a roundabout solution.
- Swantown/Heller-intersection that has raised the traffic level to warrant a signalization, leaving open to other solutions, like a roundabout.
- Boon Rd-major safety improvement, shoulders have been added and regrading to eliminate to avoid vertical curves at the hills.
- Race to Jacobs-partnering with DOT for safety improvements.

- Race to Houston Connector – new road in design and right-of-way acquisition for potential construction next year.
- Central Whidbey Bicycle Tour Road – federally funded project to identify bicycle touring in central Whidbey.
- Honeymoon Bay-turn lane project
- Sherlock/Smugglers Cove-Safety project
- Numerous Drain projects
- Swede Hill/Burley – realignment of a skewed intersection.
- Freeland Trail Segment 1-feasibility to look at Clinton to Ken's Corner Trail, Clinton Non-motorized improvement project.

Camano Island

- Arrowhead Rd-adding shoulders to bring it up to modern safety standards.
- Bicycle Route project

Bill Oakes discussed the Solid Waste Facilities improvement which is a major project that ties into Island County's ability to process utilities. It is a two million dollar project to build a third digester for the septage plant. The septage plant processes septic tank pumping. This project will bring the holding ponds up to modern standard and add a third digester. The project is scheduled for next year.

Commissioner Krug asked Bill Oakes with the congestion problem occurring in Northern Whidbey are any of the proposed projects helping to alleviate that problem or is there any focus at all to help that problem?

Bill Oakes replied to Commissioner Krug that most of the problems he has heard about are the State Highway which is outside of his jurisdiction. The Clover Valley intersection is an optional route to the base.

Commissioner Yonkman stated it seems that adding a turn lanes have been really helpful. He asked if the turn lanes are somewhat affordable to do.

Bill Oakes responded to Commissioner Yonkman that it depends. A lot hinges on several costs, right of way costs, environmental costs, etc. They are always looking for the least cost alternative; there is a very modest capital budget in Island County. A lot of these projects cannot be done without the state or federal funding.

Commissioner Yonkman asked for the cost difference between a light and a roundabout.

Bill Oakes replied the primary difference in costs is the right-of-way. A roundabout has a bigger footprint and requires more right-of-way. Ongoing costs are very low with a roundabout where signal costs have an annual maintenance cost. They look for locations where the roundabouts and signal lights make sense to install.

Commissioner Krug asked if there are more accidents in a roundabout than a signal light.

Bill Oakes responded to Commissioner Krug that the accident history in a roundabout generally does not decrease the frequency of accidents but it reduces the severity.

Vice Chair Enell asked what the Swan Lake tide gate work will entail.

Bill Oakes responded to Vice Chair Enell that there has been tide gates located there as far back as 1916. It is a project to replace the system. The pipes are aging and the system needs to be replaced.

Vice Chair Enell asked if Island County Public Works has jurisdiction over the Maxwellton repair.

Bill Oakes replied to Commissioner Enell that Maxwellton is on private property. Swan Lake tide gates are on public property.

Vice Chair Enell stated he is not the biggest proponent of the Race Road to Houston bypass; the budget dwarfs any of the other projects. He has heard in the event of an accident on 525 that is the one section of the Island that there are not sufficient roads to go around. He asked if there was any written data available other than what he has just said that would justify that type of expenditure.

Bill Oakes responded to Vice Chair Enell that the analysis is anecdotal. There were a few blocking accidents at the time of the start of this project that made people think about it. The location is almost a mile and a half single point of failure in the road system and it is in the middle of the Island. An accident would isolate the south end from hospital facilities. As an engineer, the project gets his recommendation due to the single points of failures that will affect the system.

Vice Chair Enell asked if there is written justification other than word of mouth. An expenditure of that nature needs an analysis and should require a fair amount of analysis done to make sure it is worth that tremendous amount of money.

Commissioner Krug commented she has heard a lot about trucks that come from Canada coming through Coupeville and consuming the Coupeville/Port Townsend ferry times. She thinks a lot of them are now using the County roads instead of staying on state routes, it then becomes a County budget issues. She wonders if there is some way of having trucks over certain weights can be directed to only use the state routes.

Bill Oakes responded to Commissioner Krug they are working with the Department of Transportation (DOT) on ways they can implement. It is very difficult to reroute since it is a 6 mile detour to take the state highway. The other issue is that the intersection of the spur and the highway is not a great place to make a left turn.

Commissioner Krug added that going by the schools and downtown Coupeville is not very safe.

Bill Oakes replied that is also Coupeville's argument about the truck traffic going down Main Street. There also needs to be a realization that not all those trucks are going to Canada, they may also be delivering to Coupeville. It is a difficult question they are working on.

Commissioner Yonkman said Bill Oakes has reminded the Planning Commission over the years on how critical it is to keep up the maintenance of the roads and protect that large investment. He asked if funding is keeping up with the maintenance of the roads.

Bill Oakes responded the funding has stabilized after the recession. The funding source is reliant on people buying more gas to keep up with inflation; that may not be the case in the future. He

would say short term they are fine, long term is always a concern for him. No one stops the inflation of materials, labor, etc.; there is a systematic problem that will eventually reach a crisis point.

Public Comment

Steve Erickson, WEAN, Langley

Mr. Erickson asked Bill Oakes if the Swantown Lake tide gates will be fish passable.

Bill Oakes responded the present project will not make the tide gate fish passable. He said they are classic type flapper tide gates.

Mr. Erickson stated the County needs overall policies regarding transportation specifically road ends that access shorelines. There needs to be a policy towards improving public access to the shorelines. An inventory of those projects and a policy needs to be in the Comprehensive Plan or in this element of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses it. There are many road ends in Island County that potentially provide access to public shorelines that are taken over by the adjacent landowners or are not improved to a point where they can be used and it really needs to be dealt with this time around in the Update.

Ray Gabelein, Langley

Mr. Gabelein had a couple of comments to discuss.

- He agrees with Commissioner Yonkman regarding turn lanes. He is familiar with the south end, he knows in most cases it would be a joint project with the State Highway Department. There are places where the highway is wide enough; it just has to be re-stripped. He encourages the Public Works Department to look at the option since it will save lives and avoid other injuries. He has watched the accident reduction where turn lanes have been installed. He would like to see an analysis of the results where turn lanes have been installed and he encourages putting more deceleration lanes and turn lanes.
- He commented on TIP Number 49 – Sunlight Beach Road Drainage. He has had discussions with Bill Oakes and would like to see water quality testing done before the outfall is installed. The project involves taking road run off and pumping it directly to Useless Bay with zero treatment. There are very small lots with onsite septic systems; it is currently being pumped through various wetland systems. He does not disagree with getting the standing water out but he disagrees with it being pumped directly to Useless Bay. He thinks this will be another Holmes Harbor situation because the testing is not being done ahead of time. He does not disagree with putting catch basins in the low areas but it will be a problem in the future.

Commissioner Yonkman asked Bill Oakes if Mr. Gabelein's concern can be included in the budget.

Bill Oakes understands Mr. Gabelein's concern and it will be taken into account when the project is built. He currently does not know where the water is going. There have been a couple of easements fall through. It is more of a nuisance problem than it is a flooding problem but it does cover about half of a lane when it fills up with water.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if there will be water quality testing.

Bill Oakes responded typically there is concern if there is water being sent somewhere it is not already going. This would be a case where quality and quantity would be a concern. If it turns out testing is needed to make sure it is not a Holmes Harbor issue they can do that.

Vice Chair Enell said he read in the local paper that Public Works will be putting up some signage and parking directions at some number of beach public access points identified in the past. He thought it was supposed to occur this year.

Bill Oakes responded he is working with DOT on funding as part of the non-motorized trails update to look at road ends to beach access. He is hopeful they will fund the project.

Vice Chair Enell asked Bill Oakes if he is looking for funding for the non-motorized trails.

Bill Oakes responded it is being included as part of the non-motorized trail plan. The idea would be a kayak trail and it would have the ability to land in different spots like road ends and parks.

Commissioner Munson asked how much the non-motorized trail project will cost.

Bill Oakes replied the cost is in the vicinity of \$120, 000.

Vice Chair Enell asked if it would identify the parcels to people approaching by road as well as those by the water.

Bill Oakes answered Vice Chair Enell; the idea is to identify the locations in maps, signage and signage from the water also.

Commissioner Krug moved to approve the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2021; Commissioner Yonkman seconded motion.

Vice Chair Enell responded he is not going to vote in favor because in the past he thinks that a rather large expenditure such as the Race Road bypass project needs more studies and certainly needs written justification which he has not heard in three to four years now. He does not want to hold up the whole six year plan on that item but he cannot vote for the project.

Commissioner Krug asked Commissioner Enell if they singled it out of the proposal would he vote for the rest of it.

Commissioner Enell responded he would.

Vice Chair Enell made a motion to amend the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2021 by removing the Race Road bypass from the proposal, Commissioner Saul seconded the motion.

Commissioner Yonkman said Bill Oakes feels it is a valid project; if there is an incident in that section of the highway there may be a major problem with keeping traffic moving.

Bill Oakes responded to Commissioner Yonkman that he is correct. At the extremities of ferry or bridge there are other places where the network does not provide a secondary access. This location is in the middle of Whidbey Island. Unlike Camano which has a loop system, Whidbey Island has much more linear transportation system, north and south. Keeping that project in and building it gives the secondary point of access around, either temporary or more permanent construction of the highway.

Commissioner Krug asked if there are other less expensive alternatives.

Bill Oakes responded to Commissioner Krug that this would be the second new road he has built as a public employee. It is a new road through open land and is a modern standard road. It builds a network where there is no redundancy currently on access. They looked at a number of alternatives; the project was in the feasibility alternative study when he first joined Island County with a number of different alignments and ways to build a bypass route around this single point of failure. This is the option that was considered to be the best and least expensive.

Commissioner Munson asked for a breakdown of the costs.

Bill Oakes said it is roughly a six million dollar construction project.

Commissioner Munson asked how much of the cost is for acquiring right-of-way.

Bill Oakes responded they are actively acquiring the right-of-way. There have been three parcels purchased. The cost for each parcel was roughly \$100,000 per parcel.

Commissioner Munson asked if most of the project is through non-improved parcels and if they are privately owned.

Bill Oakes responded that most of the project starts at Race Road, on an existing private road that is directly north-south, after eight to ten parcels, the parcels open up to undeveloped land to Houston. All of the parcels were privately owned.

Commissioner Enell stated when looking at other projects such as intersection improvements which are in the order of half a million or so, there are a number of projects that do not get scheduled due to lack of funding, then there are six million dollars being spent on something like this. That particular section of road is flat and there are no steep slopes that would prevent traffic from getting anywhere. There are very wide shoulders in that area and he wonders what the possibility of that fraction of road getting blocked where nobody can get by for an extended period of time. Before 6.2 million dollars are spent, he would like to see justification of what other bypass roads are in that area and how much of that entire section is not able to be bypassed and what are the chances of that entire road becoming blocked. When the project discussion began there was a federal grant that came through legislature to fund it. Somehow, Island County is paying for 6.2 million dollars of it. Somewhere it seems that the written justification was not provided and he would encourage that it be done.

Commissioner Saul liked the amendment for that exact reason. Last year he raised this concern to Commissioner Jill Johnson due to the magnitude of the expense associated with the project. He is not questioning the need but just on a dollars and cents perspective, it is an order of magnitude and a factor. Due to the considerable expense he thought it warranted more discussion, justification and more analysis.

Bill Oakes added that there are other large linear projects in the plan; Boon Road and Arrowhead are 4 or 5 million dollars projects. It is a significant expense to have a mile and a half of road built. Both of those projects would compete with it in size. The problem with the New County Road is that all of the existing funding sources, state and federal can only go to existing roads since they have a functional class. The project will be funded with local money and as a systems engineer he can see the need for building this project.

Commissioner Krug agrees there is a need for the road but she thinks it needs to come back with more study.

Bill Oakes responded that if the Planning Commission significantly alters the plan and is their recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners, they can decide to stop the project and accept their recommendation or they will have to hold their own public hearing on the issue.

Vice Chair Enell stated he respected Bill Oakes' judgement on this issue and he may very well be right and he is dead wrong. What he is asking for is some written justification for people like him that think this is crucial and needed.

Bill Oakes responded it is only crucial and needed if the LP gas truck is on its side, which is one of the accidents he is familiar with and it shut down the road for the majority of the day. It is in the middle of the system and it isolates the north from the south. As a systems engineer he supports the project.

Commissioner Yonkman commented that he respects Bill Oakes' management of the roads and has done a good job. He asked Bill Oakes if he feels that there is a balance going on in particular when thinking about safety on turn lanes. They seem affective and maybe less expensive. Some funds are needed to continue to improve the system to guard against emergency situations and spending an adequate amount of money on improving safety.

Bill Oakes replied to Commissioner Yonkman that there are no black and white answers in his world and priorities are set all of the time. The reason this project has his support is that the highway is the only alternative for about a mile. Not having a redundant path for that traffic when that mile is blocked is a significant safety issue. When this project moved forward it had support from Central Whidbey Fire and others where supportive of making the redundant connection for emergency response reasons.

Commissioner Saul said he does not dispute any of what is being said. He asked Bill Oakes what other options are available for 2.5 million dollars and 3.5 million dollars go into another priority. He would like to see more analysis, justification, rationale or alternatives that provide a work around in the event of an emergency. That is his reason for supporting the amendment.

Bill Oakes commented there was an alternatives analysis but he does not think it answers the question about this road. They did do a feasibility analysis and alternative analysis with different alignments. His understanding of the question is if the probabilities of the road being blocked and the cost benefit of this project have been analyzed and the answer is no. If they are requesting for further analysis of why the project is being built, it can be done in a year since the right-of-way may not be obtained by then.

Vice Chair Enell said he believes he asked for the information last year, maybe not as directly. He does not disagree with the assessment of the situation; he cannot understand the rationale on spending that type of money on a project without having a study of the necessity and the alternatives of how it can be done.

Bill Oakes replied they have looked at the alternatives.

Vice Chair Enell stated he does not doubt they have been done but he has not seen them.

Commissioner Yonkman asked Vice Chair Enell if there is an alternative to his amendment.

Vice Chair Enell responded he would strongly suspect it would be totally agreeable, he just thinks it sets a poor precedence that Island County would spend that type of money without any documentation at all he has seen, having bird dogged it for three years now. That is maybe not

the best way of doing business. He does not think the end result would be pulling the plug on the project but it would sure be a better way of analyzing and coming up to a decision that people like the Planning Commission has to make on whether to do that or not and receive the data to see if it is really necessary and if it can be done without much expense.

Commissioner Yonkman stated that last year it was discussed but there was no action.

Vice Chair Enell said he certainly talked about it but he didn't make the motion nor did he vote against the transportation budget last time around. But this year he is asking for a motion to provide documentation that the project is necessary and that they have chosen the best alternative.

Commissioner Yonkman asked Bill Oakes if the materials can be provided without pulling the plug, even though they do not have the final word.

Vice Chair Enell revised the amendment that they will approve the transportation budget contingent upon Public Works providing documentation on the necessity of the project and the particular design and associated cost chosen and other alternatives considered.

Bill Oakes stated there was a study done by a consultant on alternatives and they will be provided to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Saul seconded the revised amendment, motion carried unanimously.

Bill Oakes reminded the Planning Commission that there is also a Capital Facilities Plan of which the Transportation Plan is just one of the line items and a motion is needed to accept it.

Commissioner Krug asked if it is tied to paragraph 10 of the Capital Facilities Element or is the Planning Commission just approving the budget.

Bill Oakes said it is the six year fiscal plan for the Capital Facility Plan. The transportation trails and storm water projects are all in this plan; the detail is in the Transportation Element.

Commissioner Yonkman asked Bill Oakes how the issue of the bypass fits into this element.

Bill Oakes responded only the gross budget is included. The entire year's budget is included in the plan not individual projects.

Commissioner Krug asked if they can still approve the Capital Expenditures Plan subject to the prior approval.

Bill Oakes responded Commissioner Krug is correct.

Commissioner Krug moved to approve the Capital Expenditures Budget subject to the previous approval, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Workshop to discuss the following topics:

- **Review of critical areas updates Existing Conditions Report.**
 - Dave Wechner presented the Draft Existing Conditions Report and the items that are covered by the report. He explained its purpose and where it falls into the Comprehensive Plan Update. The report was produced by the Consultant, ESA, as part of the Critical Areas Ordinance Update. He further described the review process the Draft Existing Conditions Report underwent. The report includes water quality monitoring information collected by the County since 2007. He

explained terms and acronyms that will be found throughout the report. The Existing Conditions Report does not include recommended changes, it has to be done in the Gap Analysis; and it does not include the current year's data of land clearing. The transmitted documents to the Planning Commission included comments from the Whidbey Environmental Action Network (WEAN), Island County Critical Areas Planner Greg Goforth, Island County Hydrogeologist Doug Kelly, and a table showing the TAG comments submitted and how they were addressed by the Consultant team.

- Commissioners asked if the comments received will be provided to the TAG. Staff responded the WEAN comments will be addressed in the revision by the Consultant.
- Commissioners asked for a definitions page to be added.
- Landscape connectivity should be considered in a comprehensive manner. Regulations that occur outside of the critical areas and how it affects those areas.
- How to obtain balance between critical areas and GMA requirements, i.e. no net loss.
- Commissioners asked Doug Kelly to address:
 - The differences between 2005 and present, regarding sea water intrusion.
 - Aquifer concerns and impacts due to temperatures and rainfall.
- Commissioners asked staff to address a TAG comment regarding no consensus on the definition of wetlands health, let alone an accepted procedure for measuring it comprehensibly.
 - Greg Goforth addressed the wetland monitoring program and its intent. The term is not clearly defined in Paul Adamus' 2006 Best Available Science document. Due to the unclear consensus on wetland health, Paul Adamus explores different indicators of wetland health.
- **Review existing Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.**
 - Dave Wechner presented an overview on Water Resources Element and Capital Facilities Element. Staff identified the need to add details about Surface Water Monitoring, Water Utilities Program, Chlorinated System Plan and Critical Areas Regulations to protect water resources. The Water Resources Element will need updating to reflect changes in state law, such as requiring water metering.
 - Commissioners asked about implementing Low Impact Development (LID) and how they may be incorporated into the Water Resources Element and grey water usage.
 - Keith Higman discussed LIDs. He said LIDs are voluntary and approved through site specific development applications for conditions that might be applied to a development permit. When Clean Water Utility was adopted, one of the elements of that utility was the implementation of LID investments in the County. The Planning Commission at some point will address if LIDs will be voluntary or prescriptive.

- Keith Higman discussed the grey water usage and recommendations for recycling it.
 - Commissioners asked if the incorporated areas and unincorporated areas are similarly regulated or have similar goals.
 - Keith Higman responded the one difference with the County Health Department from the other departments is that they are also the Cities' Health Department. The hydrogeologist is available for cities if they have questions or concerns about water resources. He further explained the Health Department's role in the municipalities.
 - Commissioners asked for clarification on Capital Projects for parks and recreation. There are currently 540 acres available for parks and recreation purposes and only 291 acres are required. Nathan Howard responded that it was being updated and there are some inventory differences. Further discussion continued regarding the park inventory.
- Dave Wechner explained the Capital Facilities Element (CFP) and staff's approach to updating it.
 - Commissioner Krug liked the presentation of Thurston County's Capital Facility Plan.
 - Nathan Howard explained the changes being made to Island County's Capital Facility Plan. He discussed the five requirements in the CFP.
 - Commissioner Enell asked if the County is obligated to fund a portion of the Freeland Sewer. Dave Wechner responded it depends on how much the system costs and how much funding the Freeland Water Sewer District may acquire.
 - Commissioner Munson asked staff what the inner agency is for outdoor recreation and what is RCO? It is Recreation and Conservation Office, it helps finance recreation and conservation projects throughout the state.
- **Discuss the potential reorganization and reformatting of the Comprehensive Plan.**
 - Nathan Howard explained the sample Comprehensive Plan re-formats.
 - Meredith Penny addressed the illustration of each goal at the beginning of each section.
 - Dave Wechner said the goal is to have an electronic accessible document with links.
 - Commissioner Enell liked the Mukilteo Plan and the reformat is moving in that direction.
- **Update on rural land use outreach effort.**
 - Meredith Penny recapped the current plan of the survey distribution. Based on feedback, staff will increase the survey distribution to 200 parcels in each planning area. Staff has received feedback from the County Commissioners as well as the public and hope to incorporate it into the final survey. There will be meetings held in October in each planning area to discuss the survey feedback.
 - Commissioner Saul asked what the difference is between sending the survey to 100 vs. 200, etc. parcels. Dave Wechner responded taking all the comments and putting them into a summary.

- Commissioner Krug thought the survey was leading to a direct result and is not a very balanced survey. She submitted her comments to staff.
 - Commissioner Enell said the use of surveys is a wonderful approach to communicate and will get far more useful data than the historical way of having public meetings.
 - Commissioner Munson asked for a schedule of meetings being held.
 - Commissioner Yonkman asked for a document that lists the different documents that were given for a particular meeting. Commissioner Krug said the list is in the transmittal.
- **Update on adoption of Shoreline Master Program.**
 - Dave Wechner briefed the Planning Commission on the adoption process of the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) and the outcome. The use of net pens was the highly contested topic. Department of Ecology agreed to approve Island County's SMP conditionally with the changes recommended. The SMP needs to be implemented into the Comp Plan Update as an element. The Hearing to adopt the SMP is September 28th for the Planning Commission and October 6th for the Board's adoption.
 - Commissioner Munson asked what the problem with allowing net pen aquaculture was.
 - Dave Wechner explained the history of net pen aquaculture and why Island County was not required to allow it.

Commissioner Krug moved to adjourn, Commissioner Enell seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Shaddy